



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/674,507

10/01/2003

Kang Soo Seo

1740-000062/US

4238

30593

7590

11/25/2009

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

P.O. BOX 8910

RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

ZHAO, DAQUAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/25/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/674,507	Applicant(s) SEO ET AL.	
	Examiner DAQUAN ZHAO	Art Unit 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/19/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues, Tahara et al fail to teach plurality of pieces of graphic information having a one-to-one relationship with the plurality of graphic images. The examiner disagrees.
3. figure 8 of Tahara et al teach the "INFOFILE.001" links "HOW TO GREET" with VIDEO.001, "INFOFILE.002" links "HOW TO ANSWER" with also "VIDEO.001" and "INFOFILE.003" links "HOW TO SELF-INTRODUCE" with also "VIDEO.001".
Therefore, "INFOFILE.001", "INFOFILE.002" and "INFOFILE.003", which considered to be the claimed graphic information, has one-to-one relation with the graphic images "HOW TO GREET", "HOW TO ANSWER", and "HOW TO SELF-INTRODUCE", respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-3 and 6-25 recites the limitation "...the plurality of pieces of graphic information". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

It is believed applicant intends to refer to "...plurality of pieces of graphic link information".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al (US 5,909,551) and further in view of Kim (US 6,754,435 B2).

For claim 25, Tahara et al teach a method of reproducing graphic data stored on a recording medium, comprising:

reading link information stored in a first file on the recording medium, the link information linking text stored in a second file separate from the first file with a plurality of main video images, the plurality of main video images and the text image being stored on the recording medium (e.g. abstract, figures 2 and 8, column 8, lines 7-25, PCLINK.TBL in the <PC> directory, which is considered to be the claimed first file, links **the text data file "INFOFILE.001", "INFOFILE.002" and "INFOFILE.003" with video file, VIDEO.001**, which is considered to be the claimed "second file"); and reproducing a main video image overlaid with at least one text based on the reading of the graphic link information from the recording medium (e.g. figure 9, column 8, lines 26-48, the text data "Good Morning" is overlay on the video image data); plurality of pieces of graphic information having a one-to-one relationship with the plurality of graphic images. The examiner disagrees (e.g. figure 8 of Tahara et al teach the "INFOFILE.001" links "HOW

Art Unit: 2621

TO GREET” with VIDEO.001, “INFOFILE.002” links “HOW TO ANSWER” with also “VIDEO.001” and “INFOFILE.003” links “HOW TO SELF-INTRODUCE” with also “VIDEO.001”. Therefore, “INFOFILE.001”, “INFOFILE.002” and “INFOFILE.003”, which considered to be the claimed graphic information, has one-to-one relation with the graphic images “HOW TO GREET”, “HOW TO ANSWER”, and “HOW TO SELF-INTRODUCE”, respectively).

However, Tahara et al fail to teach linking a graphic image with plurality of main video image. Kim teach linking a graphic image with plurality of main video image (e.g. abstract, figure 14, column 1, lines 55-67, column 7, lines 47-61, subpicture or caption data are considered to be the claimed graphic data, also see column 1, lines 37-38, “sub-picture channels in the form of bit-mapped image signal”). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Kim into the teaching of Tahara et al for fast searching of the image and video data.

6. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-16, and 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al (US 5,909,551), Kim (US 6,754,435 B2), as applied to claim 25 above, and further Burgess et al (US 7,110,137 B2).

See the teaching of claim 25 above.

For claim 1, Kim teaches graphic link information associates a single graphic image with a plurality of different main video images (e.g. figure 14, column 8, lines 9-17, a VOB must contains plurality of different main video images).

Art Unit: 2621

However, Tahara et al and Kim fail to teach graphic images having different color depths. Burgess et al teach graphic images having different color depths (e.g. figure 5, column 5, line 55- column 6, line 4, the foreground image has different color depth). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Burgess et al into the teaching of Tahara et al and Kim to permit greater and/or more efficient compression by eliminating unneeded color specifying bits per pixel and/or faster compression and rendering performance (Burgess et al, column 6, lines 1-4).

Claims 6 and 16 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 1 above, wherein Tahara et al teach placing the graphic image file and graphic link information file under a specific directory defined by a file structure of the recording medium or under at least one subdirectory created below the specific directory (e.g. figure 2, PCLINK.TBL is under the subdirectory <PC> and the subdirectory <PC> is under the Root directory).

For claims 12, 13, 14, 22 and 23, Kim teach, column 5, lines 45-50, and figure 14, "the sub-picture search table", corresponding to the "link information" as claimed, link the moving picture with the sub-picture. Also see column 7, lines 41-60, the number of main video image does not make any patentable different.

For claim 2, Tahara et al teach plurality of text file and link information are grouped based on the said main video image (e.g. figure 8, the PCLINK.TBL includes "INFOFILE.001, INFOFILE.002" for video.001. therefore, the PCLINK.TBL and

Art Unit: 2621

"INFOFILE.001, INFOFILE.002" for video.001 are group under <PC> subdirectory for the <Video> directory, column 5, lines 33-47).

For claims 8 and 18, Tahara et al teach the subdirectory is created for each group of text files (e.g. column 5, lines 33-47, <PC> subdirectory is created for the text file).

For claims 9 and 19, Tahara et al teach the single text is organized to the single text file (e.g. column 5, lines 7-20, "INFOFILE.001, INFOFILE.002" are text files).

For claims 10 and 20, Tahara et al teach all of the graphic image to constitute a plurality of main video images are organized to the single graphic image file (e.g. column 5, lines 20-32, image data (e.g. video.001, video.002 in the same figure)).

For claim 11 and 21, Tahara et al teach plurality of the graphic image pertaining to same group are organized to the single graphic image file (e.g. column 5, lines 20-32, image data (e.g. video.001, video.002 in the same figure)).

For claims 3, 15 and 24, Tahara et al teach said plurality of graphic image and graphic link information are grouped based on the a title or a playlist of the recording medium (e.g. figure 8, the PCLINK.TBL includes "INFOFILE.001, INFOFILE.002" for video.001. therefore, the PCLINK.TBL and "INFOFILE.001, INFOFILE.002" for video.001 are group under <PC> subdirectory for the <Video> directory, column 5, lines 33-47, VIDEO.001, VIDEO.002 and video.003 corresponds to the claimed "playlist" because VIDEO.001, VIDEO.002 and video.003 is a list of video to be play back).

Art Unit: 2621

7. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tahara et al (US 5,909,551), in view of Kim (US 6,754,435 B2) and further in view of Burgess et al (US 7,110,137 B2), as applied to claims 1-3, 6, 8-16, and 18-24 above, and further in view of Russ (US 5,446,857).

See the teaching of Tahara et al, Kim and Burgess et al et al above.

For claims 7 and 17, Tahara et al teach the specific directory is a child directory of a root one (e.g. <PC> is a subdirectory of the Root directory, column 5, lines 7-20).

Tahara et al, Kim and Burgess et al et fail to teach the read-only directory, Russ teach the read-only directory (e.g. column 7, lines 53-59). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporate the teaching of Russ into the teaching of Tahara et al, Kim and Burgess et al et to record the file directory in the Read-only memory to protects files from being overwritten in subsequent operations.

There's no new ground(s) of rejection. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEG § 706.07 (a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136 (a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing data of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing data of this action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period. Then the shortened statutory period will expire on the data the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing data of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the data of this final action.

Art Unit: 2621

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daquan Zhao whose telephone number is (571) 270-1119. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fri. 7:30 -5, alt Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tran Thai Q, can be reached on (571)272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Daquan Zhao/

Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Thai Tran/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621